

50



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/660,733	09/13/2000	James S Wilson	004578.1073	7374

7590 09/23/2002

Jerry W Mills
Baker Botts LLP
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

CIRIC, LJILJANA V


ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3743

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

50

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/660,733	Applicant(s) Wilson et al.	
	Examiner Ljiljana V. Ciric	Art Unit 3743	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Ljiljana V. Ciric (3) _____
 (2) T. Murray Smith, Reg. No. 30,222 (4) _____

Date of Interview Aug 30, Sep 5, and Sep 11, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No. If yes, brief description:
On Sep 5, Examiner faxed a marked-up copy of the claims including possible ways of correcting indefiniteness problems to Attorney Smith. On Sep. 6, Attorney Smith faxed a draft copy of amended claims including most of the above

Claim(s) discussed: 1-18 and 20-24

Identification of prior art discussed:
n/a

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Attorney Smith telephoned Examiner Ciric on August 30 to inquire whether Examiner Ciric is a Primary Examiner; she confirmed that she is. Attorney Smith also initiated a discussion regarding the various objections and indefiniteness rejections set forth by Examiner Ciric in the Office action mailed on August 21. Examiner Ciric agreed to withdraw the remaining objection to the claims on the basis of minor informalities in the next Office action; no agreement was reached regarding any other objections or rejections. Attorney Smith explained the gist of applicant's invention. Given this additional information, Examiner Ciric submitted an informal proposal correcting most if not all of the remaining indefiniteness problems in the claims. On September 6, Attorney Smith faxed a draft copy of amended claims including most of the proposed changes and also providing counterproposals for the remaining indefiniteness problems. On September 11, Examiner Ciric notified Attorney Smith that the counterproposals were generally acceptable with regard to

35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph. AUC 9-20-02
 (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

**LJILJANA V. CIRIC
 PRIMARY EXAMINER
 ART UNIT 3743**


 Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.